

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
APRIL 11, 1980, IN THE FACULTY
CONFERENCE ROOM, SIXTH FLOOR,
LISNER HALL

1 The meeting was called to order by President Elliott at 2:17 p.m.

Present: President Elliott, Provost Bright, Registrar Gebhardtsbauer, Parliamentarian Cheh, Birnbaum, Chandler, Claeysens, Divita, Griffith, Hawkins, Hill, Jones, Kelly, Linkowski, Loeser, Packer, Pierpont, Reiss, Robinson, Schiff, Singpurwalla, Sobel, L. Solomon, Toridis, and Ziolkowski

Absent: Barron, Chitwood, Fox, Gallagher, Gordon, Liebowitz, Linton, Mazzeo, Park, Sapin, H. Solomon, and Walker

2 Professor Jones, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, offered the following tribute in memory of Professor Reuben Esselstyn Wood:

Reuben Wood's death leaves a dilemma for those who desire to put into words the meaning of his life. It is the dilemma which Pericles faced when he was charged with the responsibility of delivering the funeral oration over the fallen soldiers of Athens:

. . . when a man's listeners find it difficult to believe in the truth of what one is saying. The man who knows the facts and loves the dead may well think that an oration tells less than what he knows and what he would like to hear; others who do not know so much may feel envy for the dead, and think the orator over-praises them, when he speaks of exploits that are beyond their own capacities.

Perhaps this dilemma dissolves within this meeting of the Senate. For I am not really obliged to recommend the deeds of Reuben Wood. Indeed, to paraphrase St. Paul, we are his letter of recommendation, written on our hearts, to be known and read by all men. We all know that our participation as faculty in the governance of the University is shaped in no small measure by his

leadership for five years as Chairman of the Executive Committee and his service for sixteen years as a member of the Senate.

His service to the discipline of chemistry, his role as writer, editor, and publisher, his dedication as a teacher have all been noted in our service of remembrance. Now we rise for a moment of tribute to his untiring contribution "to the strengthening of the relations between the faculty and the administration and the improvement of the University." (The Senate rose for a moment of silent tribute.)

3 The minutes of the regular meeting of March 14, 1980, were approved as distributed.

4 Professor Hill, on behalf of the Executive Committee, moved the adoption of Resolution 80/6, "A Resolution to Clarify the Procedures and Vote Requirements Necessary to Consider Matters not on the Agenda at Regular Meetings of the Faculty Senate," and the motion was seconded. Professor Hill said that this resolution calls attention to the discrepancy between the Faculty Organization Plan and the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate as to what size majority of the Senate is needed to take up a matter not on the agenda at any regular meeting of the Senate. At the request of the Executive Committee, the Parliamentarian, Professor Cheh, drafted this resolution to resolve this disparity and he called upon Professor Cheh to speak to it. Professor Cheh said that her resolution opted for the more flexible provision of the Faculty Organization Plan vote as opposed to the more rigorous requirements of the Bylaws because in her view she thought there might be a need from time-to-time to bring up matters of some emergency before the Senate that were not on the agenda. This was not to say that such a matter would be voted upon, but at least brought to the attention of the Senate for discussion, she said. Professor Cheh pointed out that this was really a policy question in which the Senate would have to balance the need for flexibility, i.e., permitting someone who hasn't included an item on the agenda to nevertheless bring it to the Senate's attention at a regular meeting, against the reason for having an agenda in the first place: namely, to put people on notice as to precisely what matters would be taken up. Professor Cheh also pointed out that another way to accomplish this would be under Robert's Rules of Order where matters not on the agenda can be brought up by a suspension of the rules of order by a 2/3's vote of the persons present. She also noted that her resolution would strengthen the provision dealing with the agenda relating to special meetings which does not permit the taking up of any matters not on the agenda. There was no discussion. The question was called and Resolution 80/6 was adopted unanimously.

5 Under Introduction of Resolutions, Professor Hill said that he had two resolutions to introduce. The first one was entitled "Resolution on the Establishment of a Publication Prize" submitted by Professor Charles A. Moser on behalf of the George Washington University Chapter of University Professors for Academic Order which proposed the establishment of an annual award carrying a stipend of

of \$5,000 for the best scholarly book published by a full-time faculty member at this University. Professor Hill said that he would request that this resolution be referred to the Research Committee for consideration. The second resolution introduced by Professor Hill was entitled "A Resolution to Amend the University Policy on Academic Dishonesty" submitted by the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students. This resolution, Professor Hill explained, proposed a revision of the University Policy on Academic Dishonesty recommending quite a few changes from the original policy, one of which would provide for appeals to be heard by an Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee in each school, such committees to be composed of 3 faculty and 3 students, whereas the present appeal body was the Deans' Council. Professor Hill said he would refer this resolution to the Executive Committee for inclusion on the agenda for the May meeting of the Faculty Senate. Also related to the proposed revision of the Academic Dishonesty Policy was a proposed massive revision of the Judicial Code which may or may not be ready for presentation at the Senate's May meeting, he said. Since the two documents were closely related, Professor Hill said that it may not be possible to consider them separately.

6 (a) On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Hill moved the nominations for appointment by the President to the following Administrative Committees: Judicial System: Donald Linkowski, Chairman, and two of the following four persons: Mary M. Cheh, Thomas F. Courtless, Martin M. Malawer, and Randall K. Packer; Student Faculty Committee on Appeals: Russell B. Stevenson, Chairman, Gerard Huve, Margaret McIntyre, and Harry E. Yeide; Marvin Center Program Board: William M. Reynolds; Marvin Center Governing Board: James L. Breen, Neil Cohen, William C. Parke, and Michelle L. Slagle; Presidential Appeals Board: Joseph Aschheim, Jeffrey Blank, David O. David, and Eldor O. Pederson.

No other nominations were made from the floor and the slate was elected unanimously.

(b) Professor Jones nominated Professor Randall K. Packer for election to the Athletics Committee with the note that he become Chairman of that Committee in the fall occasioned by the sabbatical leave of the present Chairman. Professor Schiff nominated Mr. Jonathan Katz, student, for election to the Educational Policy Committee. Professor Hill advised the Senate that the Executive Committee had elected two temporary appointees to the Grievance Committee as replacements for two members who resigned because they were Chairmen of Academic Departments and as such are classified as Academic Administrative Officers under the Faculty Code disqualifying them from service on the Grievance Committee. Therefore, on behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Hill nominated Professor John A. Morgan, Jr., for election as Chairman of the Grievance Committee (replacing Professor John Boswell) for a one-year term ending March 1, 1981, and Professor George Stambuk for election as a member of the Grievance Committee (replacing Professor John P. Adams) for the unexpired term ending March 1, 1982.

No other nominations were made, and the nominees were elected unanimously.

Professor Hill, on behalf of the Executive Committee, then asked the Senate's approval of the establishment of a Special Committee to inquire into

faculty salary problems as they relate to cost-of-living increases, a committee which the late Professor Wood had intended to establish. He placed in nomination for election to this Committee the following faculty members: Professors John Cibinic (National Law Center), Chairman, Richard A. Kenney (Medical Center), Ali B. Cambel (School of Engineering), Arthur D. Kirsch (Columbian College), and Martha N. Rashid (School of Education). Professor Hill said that there was no intent to limit the membership of this Committee and nominations from the floor were welcomed. No further nominations were made and the Senate confirmed the establishment of the Special Committee and the election of the nominees.

6 (c) Professor Hill advised the Senate that the next meeting of the Executive Committee was April 18th and that if Committee Chairmen wished to place an item on the agenda for the May 2nd Senate meeting it would be necessary for the Executive Committee to have it by April 18th. He reported that the School of Public and International Affairs had elected Professor John A. Morgan, Jr., to serve out the unexpired term of Professor Marvin Gordon who would be going on sabbatical leave Fall 1980 but who had asked to be relieved of his Senate duties effective at the start of the 1980 Summer Session.

(d) Professor Hill reported that the Executive Committee had asked Professor Park to explore with the Dean and the Faculty of the Law School a way of resolving the anomaly that arose when the Senate addressed the question of non-tenure-accruing percentages at its last meeting, exempting the Law School. He said that since Professor Park was not present to report on this matter, Professor Hill did not know what progress had been made thus far.

Professor Claeysens reported that the Public Ceremonies Committee was moving ahead on the resolution passed at the Senate's last meeting concerning the dinner honoring both faculty with 25 years' service to the University and faculty achieving Emeritus status. He said that the invitations would be sent out shortly and that the dinner would be held May 3rd at 6:30 p.m., in the Marvin Center Ballroom. He said that a need for tenors still existed for one portion of the entertainment, and anyone interested in helping out in this regard should contact him or Professor Jones.

Professor Schiff reported that the Educational Policy Committee was still wrestling with the matter of interschool enrollments but he hoped to have a resolution to present to the Senate before too long. Another matter under discussion by the Committee, he said, was the standardization of the drop-period for the University.

6 (e) The Annual Report of the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee (including Fringe Benefits) had been received and distributed to the faculty. Professor Hill said that all Annual Reports for the 1979-80 Session had been received with the exception of the University Objectives Committee.

7 There were no Brief Statements offered.

8 The meeting was adjourned by the President at 2:45 p.m.



Robert Gebhardtsbauer
Secretary

RESOLUTION TO CLARIFY THE PROCEDURES AND VOTE REQUIREMENTS
NECESSARY TO CONSIDER MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA AT REGULAR
MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY SENATE (80/6)

WHEREAS, Article III, Section 4(c) of the Faculty Organization Plan provides in part: "If, at any regular meeting, any item of business is deemed sufficiently urgent by the majority of the faculty members of the Senate, or by two-thirds of the faculty members present and voting, whichever is the greater, action may be taken with regard thereto by the Senate at such meeting without its previous inclusion in the agenda"; and

WHEREAS, Section 9(a) of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate provides: "If at a regular meeting a Resolution is put in the hands of all the members in writing, one copy to each member, it may be taken up under a suspension of the rules of order if three-fourths of the elected members so vote, or upon the unanimous vote of any lesser number of members present": and

WHEREAS, these two provisions are conflicting and create uncertainty over the proper procedures and voting requirements necessary to consider matters not on the agenda at regular meetings of the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, a proper balance should be struck between flexibility to meet emergency needs and the notice function of an advanced agenda; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the conflict between Article III, Section 4(c) of the Faculty Organization Plan and Section 9(a) of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate be resolved by amending the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate as follows:

1. Delete the last sentence of Section 2(b).
2. Delete all of Section 9 and renumber the remaining sections as Sections 9 and 10.
3. Add the following underlined language to Section 2:

Section 2 . . .

(d) The Agenda for a regular meeting shall be accompanied by copies of reported Resolutions scheduled for debate, including those which originate in Committees and have not theretofore been introduced, and copies of Committee Reports submitted with Resolutions. If, at any regular meeting, any item of business is deemed sufficiently urgent by a majority of the faculty members of the Senate, or by two-thirds of the faculty members present and voting, whichever is the greater, action may be taken with regard thereto by the Senate at such meeting without its previous inclusion in the Agenda.

(e) The Agenda for a special meeting shall be prepared by the

Executive Committee and may be incorporated in the call for the meeting. The minutes of the special meeting shall be approved at the next regular meeting. No Resolution, nor any item of business, not on the Agenda for the special meeting shall be considered by the Senate.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
March 28, 1980

Adopted April 11, 1980

Memorandum to Professor Peter Hill, Chairman, Executive Committee
from Charles A. Moser, Professor of Slavic
April 8, 1980

Faculty Senate
C. Moser

On behalf of the George Washington University Chapter of University Professors for Academic Order, I should like to submit the following for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

RESOLUTION ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PUBLICATION PRIZE

Whereas, the George Washington University is actively seeking to raise academic standards among both faculty and students, and Whereas, research and publication are a vital index of a university's commitment to the advancement of the frontiers of knowledge,
Be it resolved, that the University establish an annual award carrying a stipend of \$5,000 for the best scholarly book published by a full-time faculty member at the George Washington University.

Referred by the Faculty Senate, April 11, 1980, to the Research Committee

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE UNIVERSITY POLICY ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

WHEREAS, the University Policy on Academic Dishonesty has now been in effect for three years and,

WHEREAS, experience with the Policy indicates a need for adjustments to accomplish the following objectives:

1. enlarge the sanctions appropriate to the offenses;
2. increase safeguards to alleged offenders, faculty and administration following these procedures;
3. increase efficiency with which the policy is implemented;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY APPROVES THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY POLICY AS AMENDED.

The Joint Committee of Faculty & Students
April 4, 1980

Referred by the Faculty Senate, April 11, 1980, to the Executive Committee for inclusion on the agenda for the May 2, 1980, Faculty Senate meeting.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY POLICY ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

DRAFT
Spring, 1980

The University community in order to fulfill its purposes must establish and maintain guidelines of academic behavior. Although all members of the community are expected to exhibit honesty and competence in their academic work, incoming students to all colleges and divisions have a special responsibility to acquaint themselves with, and make use of, all proper procedures for doing research, writing papers and taking examinations.

To insure that such procedures are known, instructors of basic survey courses must provide their students with information sheets setting forth those procedures and giving examples of plagiarism and other acts of academic dishonesty.

Members of the community will, thereafter, be presumed to be familiar with the proper academic procedures and held responsible for applying them. Deliberate failure to act in accordance with such procedures will be considered academic dishonesty. Failure to observe these procedures by reason of ignorance or inadvertence constitutes academic incompetence. Faculty members must decide whether a student's noncompliance is an act of dishonesty or an act of incompetence. Although incompetence may be dealt with in the normal evaluative manner, acts of academic dishonesty are a legal, moral, and intellectual offense against the community and cannot be tolerated.

All members of the community, students and faculty members alike, have a responsibility to prevent acts of academic dishonesty, or, if they have occurred, to note and act upon them and to keep them from recurring. Some examples of academically dishonest behavior include:

1. Plagiarism.
2. Copying from another student's examination.
3. Submitting work that was prepared in advance for an in-class examination.
4. Representing purchased material as one's own work.

The remainder of this statement aims SOLELY at informing students of their rights and responsibilities with respect to academic dishonesty. The procedures outlined below apply to cases of academic dishonesty only, and not to cases of academic incompetence.

Procedures

When faculty members discover or have brought to their attention instances of apparent academic dishonesty, they must, within fifteen (15) days of the discovery (or of being informed of the apparent alleged act), upon consultation with their departmental chairperson, act to invoke against the alleged offender one or more of the following sanctions:

- (a) A zero for the work product.
- (b) A grade of "F-Academic Dishonesty" for the course or other academic requirement, the notation, "Academic Dishonesty", to be expunged two years after the imposition of the penalty, or upon graduation, whichever occurs first.
- (c) A grade of "F-Academic Dishonesty" for the course or other academic requirement, with the notation remaining on the permanent record.
- (d) Suspension of the student from the University for a specified period.
- (e) Expulsion of the student from the University with the notation of "Academic Dishonesty."

A record of the academic dishonesty offense or offenses shall be kept in the office of the Dean in the school or division in which the student is registered. Earlier offenses may be considered in establishing sanctions, but not in establishing guilt.

In all cases where a faculty member imposes, or seeks to impose one or more of the aforementioned sanctions, he must present the student with a completed copy of the attached form, entitled "Charge of Academic Dishonesty," in which he sets forth the nature of the charge(s) and the nature of the sanction(s).

The faculty member shall also send a copy of this form to the Dean of the school in which the student is registered. The case shall be adjudicated in that school.

The faculty member shall also inform the student of the availability at the Dean's Office of copies of this "Statement of University Policy on Academic Dishonesty" and of the "Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities."

- (1) If the student and the Dean agree that the charge is accurate, and that the sanction sought by the faculty member is appropriate, the fact of this agreement shall be noted by the signatures of the student and the Dean on the copy of the charge form. The form shall be deposited with the Dean, and the sanction shall be imposed.

(2) If the student or the Dean believes that the charge is not accurate or the sanction is not appropriate, he/she may appeal to the school's Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee which shall hear the charge and decide the issue. Appeals must be submitted within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the charge (exclusive of weekends and holidays). The student may appeal the decision of the school Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee to the Student-Faculty Committee on Appeals. Appeals must be made in writing within fifteen (15) days (exclusive of weekends and holidays) of receipt of the school Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee decision. Appeals to the Student Faculty Committee on Appeals and all subsequent appeals are to be conducted in accordance with the University's "Judicial Document."

Each school Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee shall consist of three (3) faculty members from the school appointed by the Dean of the school and three (3) students from the school appointed by the elected student government of the school. In the event that a school does not have an elected student government, the University Student Association shall appoint the student members. Each school Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee shall elect its own presiding officer. In the event that the student body is unable to appoint available students in a timely manner they shall be appointed by the Dean.

Safeguards During Procedure

The student shall be accorded those standards of fairness and rights outlined in Section V.B. of the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

Should the student be found innocent of the charges, all records of the charges (and the proceedings) shall be destroyed.

Should appeal procedures not be completed before the "due date" for the semester grades, the faculty member shall record the grade of "I" for the student until the charges have been finally adjudicated. For other academic requirements (e.g. theses, comprehensive examinations, etc.), no sanctions shall go into effect until the completion of all appeals that are to be undertaken.

Supplemental Guidelines

All departmental chairpersons are held responsible for their faculty members' knowledge of and application of the foregoing statement. Chairpersons are also required to develop and to publicize to their students and faculty a set of departmental guidelines for academic competence and honesty appropriate to their discipline. Different schools and divisions are also free to develop supplemental guidelines in conformity with this University policy.

Amendments to this policy shall be subject to the approval of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, the University Student Association, the Faculty Senate, and the President of the University.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

CHARGE OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

DATE: _____

TO: _____
(name of student)

You are charged with _____
(type of academic dishonesty)

for the work product entitled _____

date work was submitted _____

for the following class _____
(title of class--department and course number)

Sanction: _____

Witnesses (if any) : _____

Attached to this complaint is: The George Washington University Policy on Academic Dishonesty, and the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

It is urged that you read and become familiar with these documents. If you wish clarification of the procedures for handling this charge, see your Dean.

You have the option of appealing the charges or waiving that right. If you waive your right to appeal you will be assumed to be guilty and you may accept the sanction invoked. If you choose to appeal and desire an advisor, you may provide your own or you may ask the Executive Secretary to the Judicial System to provide you one. If you choose to appeal, you may consult an advisor and plan your defense.

A copy of this complaint will be filed with the Dean of the School in which you are registered.

Signed _____
(Professor)

I have been provided with a copy of the Academic Dishonesty Policy and the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

Date

Student's Signature

I have read this complaint, the Academic Dishonesty Policy, and the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities, and I waive my right to an appeal of this charge.

Date

Student's Signature

Date

Dean's Signature

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate

April 1, 1980

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, April 11, 1980, at 2:10 p.m., in the Faculty Conference Room on the Sixth Floor of Lisner Hall.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. In memoriam Professor Reuben E. Wood (by Professor Robert G. Jones)
3. Minutes of the regular meeting of March 14, 1980
4. Resolutions:

A RESOLUTION TO CLARIFY THE PROCEDURES AND VOTE REQUIREMENTS NECESSARY TO CONSIDER MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA AT REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY SENATE (80/6); Professor Peter P. Hill, Chairman, Executive Committee (resolution attached)

5. Introduction of Resolutions
6. General Business:
 - (a) Nomination for appointment by the President to the following Administrative Committees: Judicial System: Jenckes (Chairman), Martin M. Malawer, and Thomas F. Courtless; Student-Faculty Committee on Appeals: Russell B. Stevenson (Chairman), Gerard Huve, Margaret McIntyre, and Harry E. Yeide; Marvin Center Program Board: William M. Reynolds; Marvin Center Governing Board: James L. Breen, Neil Cohen, William C. Parke, and Michelle L. Slagle; Presidential Appeals Board: Joseph Aschheim, Jeffrey Blank, David O. Davis, and Eldor O. Pederson
 - (b) Additional Nominations to Senate Standing Committees and other committees
 - (c) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Peter P. Hill, Chairman
 - (d) Interim Reports of Senate Standing Committees
 - (e) Annual Reports: Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies, including Fringe Benefits (report attached)

7. Brief Statements
8. Adjournment



Robert Gebhardtsbauer
Secretary

RESOLUTION TO CLARIFY THE PROCEDURES AND VOTE REQUIREMENTS
NECESSARY TO CONSIDER MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA AT REGULAR
MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY SENATE (80/6)

WHEREAS, Article III, Section 4(c) of the Faculty Organization Plan provides in part: "If, at any regular meeting, any item of business is deemed sufficiently urgent by the majority of the faculty members of the Senate, or by two-thirds of the faculty members present and voting, whichever is the greater, action may be taken with regard thereto by the Senate at such meeting without its previous inclusion in the agenda"; and

WHEREAS, Section 9(a) of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate provides: "If at a regular meeting a Resolution is put in the hands of all the members in writing, one copy to each member, it may be taken up under a suspension of the rules of order if three-fourths of the elected members so vote, or upon the unanimous vote of any lesser number of members present"; and

WHEREAS, these two provisions are conflicting and create uncertainty over the proper procedures and voting requirements necessary to consider matters not on the agenda at regular meetings of the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, a proper balance should be struck between flexibility to meet emergency needs and the notice function of an advanced agenda; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the conflict between Article III, Section 4(c) of the Faculty Organization Plan and Section 9(a) of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate be resolved by amending the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate as follows:

1. Delete the last sentence of Section 2(b).
2. Delete all of Section 9 and renumber the remaining sections as Sections 9 and 10.
3. Add the following underlined language to Section 2:

Section 2 . . .

(d) The Agenda for a regular meeting shall be accompanied by copies of reported Resolutions scheduled for debate, including those which originate in Committees and have not theretofore been introduced, and copies of Committee Reports submitted with Resolutions. If, at any regular meeting, any item of business is deemed sufficiently urgent by a majority of the faculty members of the Senate, or by two-thirds of the faculty members present and voting, whichever is the greater, action may be taken with regard thereto by the Senate at such meeting without its previous inclusion in the Agenda.

(e) The Agenda for a special meeting shall be prepared by the

Executive Committee and may be incorporated in the call for the meeting. The minutes of the special meeting shall be approved at the next regular meeting. No Resolution, nor any item of business, not on the Agenda for the special meeting shall be considered by the Senate.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
March 28, 1980

and I am also in India because we have been invited to attend
the 10th World Congress of the World Health Organization.
We are a delegation of Indian researchers from our hospital
and other institutes who have come over to the International Congress
center and are attending the 10th

World Congress of the World Health Organization.

4/8/80

TO FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS:

The attached report was inadvertently omitted as an attachment to the Senate agenda; the attachments to the Senate minutes were not inadvertently omitted. Because of volume, it was necessary to mail the attachments in a separate envelope which should follow in due course.

Faculty Senate Office *[Signature]*

RSITY

March 12, 1980

Faculty Senate Committee on Appointments,
Salary and Promotion Policies

Annual Report 1979-80

During this year, the Committee was represented on the Ad Hoc Committee on Retirement (by it's chairman) and joint meetings with the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom to discuss issues related to the rights and privileges of full time, non-tenured faculty members.

Primary issues discussed by the committee this year were the following:

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
a. our involvement in tuition exchange	a. no recommendation at this time; comparative fringe benefit packages of similar universities are under study
b. utilization of undergraduate tuition benefits to children of faculty for graduate study	b. idea was rejected as too costly for the few that would be eligible
c. inclusion of TIAA-CREF benefits for summer teaching	c. interpretation by the university is summer salaries are "part-time" making all "part-time" faculty eligible for such benefits. Idea was not pressed at this time.
d. sufficiency of moving expenses	d. have been substantially upgraded by the administration/no committee action necessary

Faculty Senate Report

March 12, 1980

The committee has had referred to it the following motions which have not been completed and will be carried over to the next session:

- a. tuition exchange
- b. alternatives to TIAA-CREF to protect future retirement benefits
- c. exploration of changes in faculty handbook relative to benefits for children of deceased faculty.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay R. Shotel
Chairman

Committee members: E. Albert, J. Burks, L. Gallo, J. Heddesheimer
J. Levy, P. Shane, S. Sherman, M. Silverman,
A. Thompson, D. Weaver
ex-officio: H. Bright

2000-07-07

2000-07-07

2000-07-07

2000-07-07

2000-07-07

2000-07-07

2000-07-07

2000-07-07

2000-07-07

2000-07-07

2000-07-07

2000-07-07